

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Original claims 1-3 of the present application were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a) in view of Schena et al. (U.S. Publication No. US2001/0001854) and claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Schena et al. in view of Moen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,864,604). As stated in the June 4, 2003 Office Action, the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, and therefore, the invention was not readily ascertainable.

In response, Applicant prepared and submitted for review the above-identified substitute claims. In an August 22, 2003 Interview with the Examiner, these claims were discussed and it was agreed that the Schena et al. and Moen et al. references do not apply to the substituted claims, and that the substituted claims do not appear to have §112 deficiencies. The Examiner agreed that the prior rejections were moot in view of the amended claims, but that a new search would be required.

Accordingly, Applicant submits new claims 4-13 which are patentable distinct over the previously cited references. Applicant respectfully requests reexamination and reconsideration of the application was amended.

Respectfully submitted,

KELLY BAUERSFELD LOWRY & KELLEY, LLP

Aaron T. Borrowman
Registration No. 42,348

ATB/kr
6320 Canoga Avenue, Suite 1650
Woodland Hills, California 91367
(818) 347-7900